# Utah Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS) EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF REPORT JOHN HANCOCK CHARTER SCHOOL February 13, 2006

The attached report contains the results of the first two phases (Self-Assessment Process and On-Site Validation Visit) of the Utah Special Education Program Improvement Planning System (UPIPS). This Continuous Improvement Monitoring Process is conducted by the Utah State Office of Education (USOE) Special Education Services (SES), as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Part B. The process is designed to focus resources on improving results for students with disabilities through enhanced partnerships between district programs, USOE-SES, the Utah Personnel Development Center, parents, and advocates.

The first phase of this process included the completion of the Self-Assessment and the development of a Program Improvement Plan. The second phase, On-Site Validation, conducted in John Hancock Charter School on October 25-26, 2005, included student record review, interviews with school administrators, related service professionals, teachers, parents, and students. Information from these data sources was shared in an exit meeting attended by staff from John Hancock Charter School and members of the Steering Committee.

This report contains a more complete description of the process utilized to collect data and to determine strengths, areas out of compliance with the requirements of IDEA, and recommendations for improvement in each of the core IDEA areas.

### **Areas of Strength**

The validation team found the following:

#### **General Supervision**

- John Hancock Charter School requires strong parent involvement in a variety of ways that can be adapted to meet the parent's personal needs.
- School staff are implementing knowledge from training into special education files and practices with IEPs and evaluations.
- Students felt that special education services helped them succeed better academically.
- General education teachers were supportive of special education programs and want all students to succeed.
- Reading Specialist visits regular classrooms and provides individualized instruction, enabling special education students to receive specialized reading instruction along with their peers.
- FM systems are available and utilized in all general education classrooms.
- Strong paraprofessional support is provided in both special education and general education classrooms.
- School climate was friendly and orderly, with student artwork prominently displayed in the hallways.
- Special education files were very well organized.

## **Parent Involvement**

- Parents responded in survey that they received copies of IEPs and evaluation summary reports.
- Parents feel they have a strong and valued role in their child's IEP.
- Parents report that their students receive all services listed on their IEPs.
- Parents feel that their student's general education teacher has a strong role in the IEP meeting and has input into what their student's specific needs are.
- Special education strengths, as reported by parents, include: individualized, small group settings, school encourages learning from peers in inclusionary settings, their child's self-confidence issues are addressed, the school staff accept and value parental opinions, and the small size of the school helps their child.
- Parents feel that the school personnel are respectful of parents and willing to listen.
- Parents report that their students are being helped by the special education services provided at the school.
- Accommodations listed on IEPs are being provided to the students in the general education classrooms, based upon parent report and observation.
- The parent focus group was a sincere sharing of positive experiences and concerns. Parents were well-informed and pleasant in discussing their views of the special education program.

# Free Appropriate Public Education in the Least Restrictive Environment

- File review checklist is an efficient method for reviewing files and will be conducted with each file.
- Range of placement options available at John Hancock Charter School meets the needs of their students with disabilities.

- Students receive the services as per their IEP when scheduled and as part of their core academic classes, when appropriate.
- Files were organized, with backup information attached.
- Special education staff demonstrated a willingness to learn and apply that knowledge.

#### **Transitions**

• John Hancock Charter School does not have students of transition age at this time.

#### **Disproportionality**

- This area was included under General Supervision during UPIPS 2004-2005.
- School ethnicity and disability rates are comparable to state rates and charter school enrollment.
- John Hancock Charter School reported no suspension/expulsions for longer than 10 days during the 2004-2005 school year.

### **Areas of Systemic Noncompliance\***

- ✓ Pre-Referral Interventions form did not document at least 2 classroom interventions implemented before referral. Pre-Referral Interventions form did not document at least 2 classroom interventions failed, with supporting data.
- ✓ Record of Access forms missing.
- ✓ Off-Site Data not all submitted/in compliance: forms, child find, evaluation materials, history of failed classroom interventions, history of failed interventions, paraeducator job roles, and listing of surrogate parents.
- ✓ Copies to parents of Eligibility Determination, Review of Existing Evaluation Data form, Evaluation Summary Reports, and IEPs not documented.
- ✓ Notice of Meeting for IEP meetings, placement meetings, and eligibility meeting missing or incomplete.
- ✓ Parental Input was not documented as used to gather relevant functional/developmental information for eligibility.
- ✓ Prior Written Notice of IEP implementation and change of placement missing.
- ✓ Eligibility Determination did not document participation by regular education teacher, LEA, or parent.
- Evaluation Procedures not followed. Evaluation Procedures not followed in that students were not assessed in all areas related to suspected disability and sufficiently comprehensive to identify needs. Evaluation Procedures not followed in that Evaluation Summary Report missing or did not include data. Evaluation Procedures for CD classification did not include the use of multiple measures of assessment. Evaluation Procedures for SLD classification did not include the use of an observation of the student's academic performance in the regular classroom setting. Evaluation Procedures for SLD classification did not include the preparation of an evaluation summary report that includes the relevant behavior noted during the observation. Evaluation Procedures for SLD classification did not include the preparation of an evaluation summary report that includes the description of the instructional environment in which the observation took place.
- ✓ IEP PLAAFP statements did not include how the disability affects involvement/progress in the general curriculum. IEP did not document the participation of the regular education teacher. IEP team addressed communication needs on IEP, but did not select it as a special factor. IEP did not document ESY decision. IEP did not document goals, services, and amount of time needed if ESY was selected.
- ✓ Placement decisions blank or not addressed.
- ✓ Timelines for placement review, IEP review/revision, and reevaluation exceeded.

<sup>\*</sup>These areas represent items where the visiting team could not locate appropriate documentation of requirements of IDEA 2004 and Utah State Special Education Rules in student records or other data sources.